

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

TERRY MCNEIL,

Plaintiff.

v.

GLOBAL TEL-LINK, *et al.*,

Defendants.

No. 3:15-CV-01243

(Judge Brann)

(Magistrate Judge Saporito)

ORDER

MAY 23, 2018

Before the Court for disposition is a Report and Recommendation filed by Magistrate Judge Joseph F. Saporito, Jr.¹ In this Report, Magistrate Judge Saporito recommends that this action be transferred pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a) to the United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas for consolidation with the substantively identical class action pending before it, namely *In re Global Tel*Link Corp. ICS Litig.*, Civil Action No. 5:14-cv-5275-TLB (W.D. Ark.).² Plaintiff has not filed Objections to this Report and Recommendation within the applicable briefing schedule.³

¹ ECF No. 63.

² *Id.*

³ See M.D.Pa. LR 72.3; M.D.Pa. LR 72.2 (setting forth the briefing schedule for Objections to Reports and Recommendation).

Upon designation, a magistrate judge may “conduct hearings, including evidentiary hearings, and . . . submit to a judge of the court proposed findings of fact and recommendations.”⁴ Once filed, this Report and Recommendation is disseminated to the parties in the case who then have the opportunity to file written objections.⁵ Where no objection is made to a report and recommendation, the court should, as a matter of good practice, “satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.”⁶ Nevertheless, whether timely objections are made or not, the district court may accept, reject or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.⁷

Following independent review of the record, I am satisfied that the Report and Recommendation contains no clear facial error. In the interests of judicial economy, I will not rehash Magistrate Judge Saporito’s sound reasoning and legal citation. The Court is in full agreement that this action should be transferred to the Western District of Arkansas for consolidation with the substantively identical

⁴ 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B).

⁵ 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

⁶ Fed.R.Civ.P. 72(b), advisory committee notes; *see also Univac Dental Co. v. Dentsply Intern., Inc.*, 702 F.Supp.2d 465, 469 (M.D.Pa. 2010) (citing *Henderson v. Carlson*, 812 F.2d 874, 878 (3d Cir. 1987)) (explaining that judges should give some review to every report and recommendation).

⁷ 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Local Rule 72.31.

class action pending before it, or *In re Global Tel*Link Corp. ICS Litig.*, Civil Action No. 5:14-cv-5275-TLB (W.D. Ark.).

AND NOW, therefore, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that:

1. Magistrate Judge Joseph F. Saporito, Jr.'s Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 63) is **ADOPTED** in its entirety; and
2. The Clerk is directed to **TRANSFER** this case to the United States District Court for the Western District of Arkansas for consolidation with the substantively identical class action pending before it, or *In re Global Tel*Link Corp. ICS Litig.*, Civil Action No. 5:14-cv-5275-TLB (W.D. Ark.).

BY THE COURT:

s/ Matthew W. Brann
Matthew W. Brann
United States District Judge